



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/607,707

06/27/2003

Joseph Jacob Zukowski

MFCP.132805

7921

45809

7590

05/12/2008

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
(c/o MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
2555 GRAND BOULEVARD
KANSAS CITY, MO 64108-2613

EXAMINER

BONSHOCK, DENNIS G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2173

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/12/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/607,707	Applicant(s) ZUKOWSKI ET AL.	
	Examiner DENNIS G. BONSHOCK	Art Unit 2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-10,13,16-22 and 31-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-10,13,16-22 and 31-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Final Rejection

Response to Amendment

1. It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed on record in the file: Amendment as received on 1-29-2008.

2. Claims 1-38 have been examined.

Status of Claims:

3. Claims 1, 4-10, 13, 16-22, and 31-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scherr et al, Pub. No.: US 2004/0010513 A1, hereinafter Scherr and Barnett et al., Pub. No.: US 2002/0154178, hereinafter Barnett.

4. Claims 2, 3, 11, 12, 14, 15, and 23-30 have been cancelled by the Applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 4-10, 13, 16-22, and 31-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scherr et al, Pub. No.: US 2004/0010513 A1, hereinafter Scherr and Barnett et al., Pub. No.: US 2002/0154178, hereinafter Barnett.

3. With regard to claim 1, which teaches a method for enabling a user to organize a project, comprising the steps of: displaying an integral user environment to a user to

Art Unit: 2173

enable access of information pertinent to the project from within the integral user environment; receiving a list of to do items that are displayed within the integral user environment, wherein the to do items are reminders created by the user to take certain actions, Scherr teaches, in paragraphs 22-25 and in figure 1, a system for allowing a user to organize a project into a concern cascade, the cascade having a plurality of levels of concerns ranging from primary Areas of Concern (AoC) to sub-Areas of Concern displayed to the user, in order to show a user what still needs to be done (to-do) (see paragraph 19). With regard to claim 1, further teaching enabling the user to associate an entity with a single to do item selected from the list of to do items; and enabling a user to access said entity that is thus associated with the selected to do item, from within the integral user environment, Scherr further teaches, in paragraphs 35 and 42, allowing a user to associate documents (messages, word processing documents, spreadsheets, web pages, data bases, presentations, and the like), with select AoC, sub-AoC, concern, outcome, commitment and/or occasion, and further enabling a user to link to associated documents from within the concern cascade. With regard to claim 1, which further teaches wherein enabling the user to associate the entity comprises: displaying a plurality of categories of entities from which the user can select, within the integral user environment, wherein the plurality of categories of entities includes at least one member of a group comprising a Web link, a tasks, a template, and a document; in response to the user selecting one of the categories, displaying alternative choices of entities from which the user can select for association with the single to-do item selected from the list; and in response to one of the plurality of alternative choices being

selected, providing an indication that said one of the plurality of alternative choices is associated with the single to do item selected from the list, Scherr teaches associating elements from varying categories (messages, word processing documents, spreadsheets, web pages, etc.) with specific concerns in a list of concerns, and providing a visual links to the documents via the UI (see paragraphs 35 and 42), but doesn't specifically teach displaying a plurality of categories of entities for association with items in the list.

Barnett a system for associating entities (e.g. web content) with a users calendar/to-do list (see paragraphs 6, 20, and 92), similar to that of Scherr, but further teaches displaying a plurality of categories available for user selection (see paragraph 96), where upon user selection the user is provided with a list of entities specific to the selected category (see paragraph 97), that are available for user selection to be associated (added to) the to-do list / calendar (see paragraph 98). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Scherr and Barnett before him at the time the invention was made to modify to-do list of Scherr to include the incorporation of items in the to-do list by graphically displayed categorically assigned items, as did Barnett. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because Scherr describes varying categories of linked documents, where an interface to link by type would be desirable, furthermore this would provide a more organized saving of documents to associated concerns (see Scherr paragraph 42).

4. With regard to claims 4 and 32, which teach the step of automatically executing a search for relevant alternative choices of entities to display to the user, as a function of

the to do item in the list that is currently selected, Scherr teaches, in paragraphs 36 and 42, a search being done to associate entities (messages, web pages, etc.) with concerns (automatically upon receipt).

5. With regard to claims 5 and 33, which teach further comprising the step of providing alternative choices derived from other programs that are accessible to the user, Scherr teaches, in paragraph 42, the user being able to link any document by saving it to a corresponding concern.

6. With regard to claims 6 and 34, which teach further comprising the step of including a blank entity among the plurality of choices that are displayed the user, Scherr teaches, in paragraphs 35 and 42, allowing a user to associate documents, where it would be obvious to link to blank entities. One would be motivated to do so because a blank document is just an empty document (empty word processing document).

7. With regard to claims 7, 19, and 35, which teach further comprising the step of enabling the user to enter a note in association with a currently selected to do item in the list, so that the note is displayed within the integral user environment which the user subsequently again selects said to do items in the list with which the note is associated, Scherr teaches, in paragraphs 17, and 23-25 and in figure 1, associating a note with an Area of Concern, where the notes are displayed simultaneously with the Area of Concern.

8. With regard to claims 8, 20, and 36, which teach further comprising the step of enabling the user to indicate a date for association with a currently selected to do item

in the list, Scherr teaches, in paragraphs 25, 31, and 45, along with figure 6, associating a date with and Area of Concern.

9. With regard to claims 9, 21, and 37, which teach further comprising the step of automatically scheduling the date indicated by the user within a calendar program so that a user is subsequently provided a reminder by the calendar program in regard to the date thus indicated, Scherr teaches, in paragraphs 25 and 45, and in figures 1 and 6, a calendar program that provides the user with reminders of events.

10. With regard to claims 10, 22, and 38, which teach further comprising the step of providing a plurality of defined projects, each defined project including a plurality of proposed to do items that are likely relevant to a subject matter of the defined project, Scherr teaches, in paragraphs 22-25 and in figure 1, the concern cascade having a plurality of levels of concerns ranging from primary Areas of Concern (different projects) and sub-Areas of Concern displayed to the user.

11. With regard to claim 13, which teaches a system for enabling organizing a project, comprising: a memory in which a plurality of machine instructions are stored (see paragraph 6); a display on which text and graphics are displayed (see paragraph 10 and figures 1 and 5); a user input device that enables input and selection of choices provided on the display (see paragraph 42, claim 1, and figure 5); and a processor coupled to the memory, user input device, and the display (see paragraph 40), said processor executing the plurality of machine instruction to carry out a plurality of functions, including: displaying an integral user environment to a user to enable access of information pertinent to the project from within the integral user environment;

Art Unit: 2173

receiving a list of to do items that are displayed within the integral user environment on the display, wherein the to do items are reminders created by the user to take certain actions, Scherr teaches, in paragraphs 22-25 and in figure 1, a system for allowing a user to organize a project into a concern cascade, the cascade having a plurality of levels of concerns ranging from primary Areas of Concern (AoC) to sub-Areas of Concern displayed to the user, in order to show a user what still needs to be done (see paragraph 19). With regard to claim 13, further teaching enabling the user to associate an entity with a single to do item selected from the list of to do items; and enabling a user to access said entity that is thus associated with the selected items, from within the integral user environment, Scherr further teaches, in paragraphs 35 and 42, allowing a user to associate documents (messages, word processing documents, spreadsheets, web pages, data bases, presentations, and the like), with select AoC, and further enabling a user to link to associated documents from within the concern cascade. With regard to claim 13, which further teaches wherein enabling the user to associate the entity comprises: presenting a plurality of categories of entities from which the user can select, within the integral user environment; wherein the plurality of categories of entities includes at least one member of a group comprising a Web link, a task, a template, and a document, in response to the user selecting one of the categories, displaying alternative choices of entities from which the user can select for association with the single to do item selected from the list; and in response to one of the plurality of alternative choices being selected, providing an indication that said one of the plurality of alternative choices is associated with the single to do item selected from the list,

Scherr teaches associating elements from varying categories (messages, word processing documents, spreadsheets, web pages, etc.) with concerns in a list of concerns, and providing a visual links to the documents via the UI (see paragraphs 35 and 42), but doesn't specifically teach displaying a plurality of categories of entities for association with items in the list.

Barnett teaches a storage medium storing instructions (see paragraphs 66 and 67) for implementing a system for associating entities (e.g. web content) with a users calendar/to-do list (see paragraphs 6, 20, and 92), similar to that of Scherr, but further teaches displaying a plurality of categories available for user selection (see paragraph 96), where upon user selection the user is provided with a list of entities specific to the selected category (see paragraph 97), that are available for user selection to be associated (added to) the to-do list / calendar (see paragraph 98). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Scherr and Barnett before him at the time the invention was made to modify to-do list of Scherr to include the incorporation of items in the to-do list by graphically displayed categorically assigned items, as did Barnett. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because Scherr describes varying categories of linked documents, where an interface to link by type would be desirable, furthermore this would provide a more organized saving of documents to associated concerns (see Scherr paragraph 42).

12. With regard to claim 16, which teaches the step of automatically executing a search for relevant alternative choices of entities to display to the user, as a function of the to do item in the list that is currently selected, Scherr teaches, in paragraphs 36 and

42, a search being done to associate entities (messages, web pages, etc.) with concerns (automatically upon receipt).

13. With regard to claim 17, which teaches further comprising the step of providing alternative choices derived from other programs that are accessible to the user, Scherr teaches, in paragraph 42, the user being able to link any document by saving it to a corresponding concern.

14. With regard to claim 18, which teaches further comprising the step of including a blank entity among the plurality of choices that are displayed the user, Scherr teaches, in paragraphs 35 and 42, allowing a user to associate documents, where it would be obvious to link to blank entities. One would be motivated to do so because a blank document is just an empty document (empty word processing document), that would provide a user with a starting point for a document.

15. With regard to claim 31, which teaches a memory medium on which are stored machine instructions (see paragraph 6) for carrying out a method for enabling a user to organize a project, comprising the steps of: displaying an integral user environment to a user to enable access of information pertinent to the project from within the integral user environment; receiving a list of to do items that are displayed within the integral user environment, wherein the to do items are reminders created by the user to take certain actions, Scherr teaches, in paragraphs 22-25 and in figure 1, a system for allowing a user to organize a project into a concern cascade, the cascade having a plurality of levels of concerns ranging from primary Areas of Concern (AoC) to sub-Areas of Concern displayed to the user, in order to show a user what still needs to be done (to-

do) (see paragraph 19). With regard to claim 1, further teaching enabling the user to associate an entity with a single to do item selected from the list of to do items; and enabling a user to access said entity that is thus associated with the selected to do item, from within the integral user environment, Scherr further teaches, in paragraphs 35 and 42, allowing a user to associate documents (messages, word processing documents, spreadsheets, web pages, data bases, presentations, and the like), with select AoC, sub-AoC, concern, outcome, commitment and/or occasion, and further enabling a user to link to associated documents from within the concern cascade. With regard to claim 31, which further teaches wherein enabling the user to associate the entity comprises: displaying a plurality of categories of entities from which the user can select, within the integral user environment, wherein the plurality of categories of entities includes at least one member of a group comprising a Web link, a tasks, a template, and a document; in response to the user selecting one of the categories, displaying alternative choices of entities from which the user can select for association with the single to-do item selected from the list; and in response to one of the plurality of alternative choices being selected, providing an indication that said one of the plurality of alternative choices is associated with the single to do item selected from the list, Scherr teaches associating elements from varying categories (messages, word processing documents, spreadsheets, web pages, etc.) with specific concerns in a list of concerns, and providing a visual links to the documents via the UI (see paragraphs 35 and 42), but doesn't specifically teach displaying a plurality of categories of entities for association with items in the list.

Barnett teaches storing instructions (see paragraphs 66 and 67) for implementing a system for associating entities (e.g. web content) with a users calendar/to-do list (see paragraphs 6, 20, and 92), similar to that of Scherr, but further teaches displaying a plurality of categories available for user selection (see paragraph 96), where upon user selection the user is provided with a list of entities specific to the selected category (see paragraph 97), that are available for user selection to be associated (added to) the to-do list / calendar (see paragraph 98). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Scherr and Barnett before him at the time the invention was made to modify to-do list of Scherr to include the incorporation of items in the to-do list by graphically displayed categorically assigned items, as did Barnett. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because Scherr describes varying categories of linked documents, where an interface to link by type would be desirable, furthermore this would provide a more organized saving of documents to associated concerns (see Scherr paragraph 42).

Response to Arguments

The arguments filed on 1-29-2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Reasons set forth below.

As an initial matter it appears that the Applicant is arguing the references individually, when the combination of the references is being relied upon for the rejection.

The Applicant argue that the references don't teach "displaying a plurality of categories of entities from which the user can select", where "the plurality of categories of entities includes at least one member of a group comprising a Web link, a task, a template, and a document."

In response, the Examiner respectfully submits that Scherr teaches associating elements from different categories (messages, word processing documents, spreadsheets, web pages, etc.) with specific concerns in a list of concerns, and providing a visual links to the documents via the UI (see paragraphs 35 and 42), but doesn't specifically teach displaying a plurality of categories of entities for association with items in the list. Scherr is combined with Barnett to support this teaching, by displaying a plurality of categories available for user selection (graphically showing the categories: *Books, Computer and Internet, Cultural Events, Movies, etc.*) (see paragraph 96 and figure 6), where upon user selection the user is provided with a list of entities specific to the selected category (such as under the *Movies* category: *Movies in Theaters, Video releases, etc.*; and further sub categorical data: *Gods and Monsters, Belly, Elizabeth, etc.*) (see paragraph 97 and figure 7a), that are available for user selection to be associated (added to) the to-do list / calendar (see paragraph 98).

The Applicant argue that the references fail to teach "in response to the user selecting one of the categories, displaying alternative choices of entities from which the user can select for association with the single to do item selected from the list."

In response, the Examiner respectfully submits that Barnett is relied upon for this teaching, as when a category is selected from the group of a plurality of categories available for user selection (graphically showing the categories: *Books, Computer and Internet, Cultural Events, Movies, etc.*) (see paragraph 96 and figure 6), the user is provided with a list of entities specific to the selected category (such as under the *Movies* category: *Movies in Theaters, Video releases, etc.*; and further sub-categorical data: *Gods and Monsters, Belly, Elizabeth, etc.*) (see paragraph 97 and figure 7a), that are available for user selection to be associated (added to) the to-do list / calendar (see paragraph 98).

The Applicant argue that the references don't teach "in response to one of the plurality of alternative choices being selected, providing an indication that said one of the plurality of alternative choices is associated with the single to do item selected from the list."

In response, the Examiner respectfully submits that Scherr further teaches, in paragraphs 35 and 42, allowing a user to associate documents (messages, word processing documents, spreadsheets, web pages, data bases, presentations, and the like), with select AoC, sub-AoC, concern, outcome, commitment and/or occasion, and further enabling a user to link to associated documents from within the concern cascade. These documents being displayed so "the user can see all information related to the concern". Barnett further teaches that when a selection of a sub-category element is made for association with a calendar/to do item, an indication is shown next to an

item in a list of items (entries are shown under dates in the calendar such as entries 706 under Friday November 6 in figure or under a category of items to do in figure 10).

The Applicant argues that Barnett has little, if anything, to do with to-do lists.

In response, the Examiner respectfully submits that Barnett primarily deals with event associations with calendar data, but clearly states that "Events not having a specific time are listed in a To-Do list next to the scheduled events" (see paragraph 6). The calendar system is likewise analogous to the To-Do list of Scherr as events of varying categories are associated with corresponding list elements, where dates in a calendar themselves are provided with elements to be executed (to be done) on that particular day (see figure 7B).

The Applicant argue that Barnett does not teach "associating a selected entity" "with a single selected to do item that is already included in a to do list."

In response, the Examiner respectfully submits that Barnett is not being relied upon for this teaching. Scherr teaches, in paragraphs 22-25 and in figure 1, allowing a user to organize a project into a concern cascade, the cascade having a plurality of levels of concerns ranging from primary Areas of Concern (AoC) to sub-Areas of Concern displayed to the user, in order to show a user what still needs to be done (to-do) (see paragraph 19), where a user can associate documents (messages, word processing documents, spreadsheets, web pages, data bases, presentations, and the like), with select AoC, sub-AoC, concern, outcome, commitment and/or occasion, and

further enabling a user to link to associated documents from within the concern cascade (see paragraphs 35 and 42). Barnet is chiefly relied upon for the graphical display of categories of associate able data, though does associate a “selected entity” (movies in this case) with a single element (date or category) in a calendar / to do list (see paragraphs 96, 106, and 107 and figures 7B and 10).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DENNIS G. BONSHOCK whose telephone number is (571)272-4047. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 6:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.

Art Unit: 2173

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dennis Chow can be reached on (571) 272-7767. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dennis G. Bonshock/
Examiner, Art Unit 2173
5-2-08
dgb